

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Claims 18, 20 and 21 have been amended. The amendments find support throughout the specification and claims as filed. No new matter has been added. Claim 20 was amended to correct a typographical error. Amendments to claims 18 and 21 are discussed more fully below.

The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

By amending the application, the Applicants do not concede that the patent coverage available to them would not extend as far as the original claim. Rather, Applicants intend to file a continuation application to pursue the breadth of the claims as filed. Applicants believe that the Examiner has not made a sufficient showing of inherency of the teachings of the asserted prior art, especially given the lack of teachings in the cited references of the properties that Applicants have recited in their claims.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.

Rejection of claims 1-7, 11, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 22 under §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 11, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 22 under §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,906,837 to Doneen et al. ("Doneen"). This rejection is traversed.

Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, Doneen does not disclose each element of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner fails to point to where Doneen discloses transmitting light from a first location on a first surface to a second location on the first surface as presently claimed in independent claims 1, 7 and 11. The Examiner has disregarded an element of the claim to given an unreasonably broad meaning to the claims. Since the independent claims are not anticipated neither are the dependent claims 2-6, 8-10 and 12-17.

With regard to claims 18 and 19, claim 18 has been amended to clarify that the first and second ends of the light pipe do not point in directions that are oppose to each other. For example, ends that reside on the same surface both point in the same direction and are not opposed to each other nor would ends that reside in planes that

are perpendicular to each other (e.g. two walls that meet at a corner). Doneen only discloses the transmission of light through a light pipe where the ends point in opposite directions.

With regard to claims 21 and 22, claim 21 has been amended to clarify that the interfering step takes place before the light enters the light pipe. Doneen does not disclose interfering with the light before the light enters the light pipe.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 7-14 and 18-20 under §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 7-14 and 18-20 under §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,082,886 to Stanford ("Stanford"). This rejection is traversed.

In particular, Stanford only discloses a lighting source that is permanently sealed and embedded into the block meaning that the block of Stanford only transmits light from the integral light source. In no way is the block of Stanford able to act as a motion detector, as in present claims 7-10.

With regard to claims 11-14, because the light source of Stanford is sealed and embedded in the block, the light pipes utilized by Stanford do not transmit light from a first location on a surface of the substrate to a second location on the surface. Rather, the light pipes of Stanford only transmit light from the embedded light source to the surface of the block.

With regard to claims 18-20, Stanford does not disclose a light pipe having two ends, both of which are substantially coplanar with an exposed surface. Because the light pipes of Stanford are connected to an embedded light source, they only transmit light to a single end of the light pipe that is substantially coplanar with an exposed surface.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 11, 16 and 17 under §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 16 and 17 under §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,234,907¹ to Daniel ("Daniel"). This rejection is traversed.

Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, Daniel does not disclose each element of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner fails to point to where Daniel discloses transmitting light from a first location on a first surface to a second location on the first surface as presently claimed in independent claim 11.

¹ The Examiner cites to U.S. Patent No. 4,234,904 in the Office Action but lists U.S. Patent No. 4,234,907 on the 1449 form.

Furthermore, similar to Stanford above, Daniel only discloses a device in which a light source is directly attached to the light pipes. Daniel acknowledges as much in his discussion of the use of his invention for clothing:

Clothing is the most obvious example of a cloth item to which this invention can be applied. However, clothing applications are limited by the requirement of having to carry some sort of light source and batteries to supply the light to the light emitting fabrics. (emphasis added; col. 4, lines 61-65).

Daniel goes on to describe the connection of the light pipes in his invention to the light source:

The optical fibers that emerge along one or more edges of a light emitting fabric are gathered into a bundle and extended to one or more corners of the fabric where they are made into a many fibered optical light pipe with a suitable protective coating. This length of light pipe ends at some suitable distance from the corner of the cloth and is usually trimmed to a desired length. The trimmed end is polished to allow the entrance of light from the light source into the light pipe. The end of the light pipe also has a coupling or other suitable fitting attached thereto in order to readily be connected to the light source. (col. 8, lines 13-24).

As can be seen from the quoted sections, Daniel does not disclose a device that transmits light from a first location on a surface of the substrate to a second location on the surface. Rather, the light pipes of Daniel only transmit light from the attached light source to the surface of the block.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: July 26, 2005

Christopher J. Voci
Registration No. 45,184
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC
29 W. Lawrence Street, Suite 210
Pontiac, MI 48342
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215